ACTIVE CASES
Analysis February 2005 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 92
(drops excluded)

Totals for February 2005:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2005 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	$17.112.00	13	$1026.00	6.00%	5.2%
MILWAUKEE	7,438.00	8	559.00	7.52 %	6.4 %
BAL- STATE	9,674.00	5	467.00	4.83%	4.3%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE
9- Agency Preventable Errors
4- Client Error

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:
Of the 9 Agency Preventable Errors, 5 were in Milwaukee, and the other 4 were in five counties: Chippewa, Kenosha, Racine, Walworth, Waukesha. The client errors were in Milwaukee (3), and Walworth (1).

TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (9):

Regular Earned Income (2):
Failed to act timely on report that job ended
Incorrect budgeting of most recent income at review

Self-Employment (1):
Incorrect months budgeted in SEIRF estimate
(A second case had S.E. budgeting error as a secondary error)

Unearned Income(1):
Failed to delete Child Support income when ended.

Shelter Costs (1):
Failed to properly verify/ budget mortgage, property tax and homeowner ins.-review

Utilities (1):
Used incorrect utility standard

Household Composition (1):
Failed to add eligible person back into FS group timely

Childcare Expense (1) :
Failed to verify a Child Support Expense that was reported.

Other (1):
     Re-opened FS after closure date without a new application

TYPE OF CLIENT ERRORS (4):

Shelter Expense: Customer failed to report that she moved, and consequently didn't report the changes in rent and utility obligations. This was an EBD case so the moved was required to be reported.

Over 130% FPL: The customer failed to report for several months that she had exceeded the 130% Federal Poverty Level, as described in her notices.

Living Arrangement: Customer failed to report he was in prison. (EBD case, so required reporting element.)

Rental Income: At review, client failed to report rental income.

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?
One of the errors was made at application, two at review, and six made at reported change.

WHEN WERE THE CLIENT ERRORS MADE?
One client error was at review, and three were at time of the change.

EFFECT OF SMRF PROCESS: The SMRF process did not contribute toward any errors this month.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:
- Milwaukee County's sample was 43.46% of the total dollars sampled. The balance of the state had 56.53% of the total dollars sampled. Milwaukee had 54.48% of the total state error dollars.   In terms of numbers of cases in error, 8 of the 34 cases sampled in Milwaukee were incorrect, which is 23.52%. Excluding client error, 5 of 34 were Milwaukee agency error, or 14.7%. In the balance of the state, 5 of 56 cases were in error (8.92%), and excluding the client error, 4 of 56 cases were agency error (7.14%). Emphasis should continue to focus on Milwaukee improvement.
-
- The sample size was large-- 92 completed cases.

- The number of client errors increased dramatically this month. Two of the errors were for non-simplified reporting households (EBD), which have greater change reporting requirements. Perhaps a clarification to workers listing the types of changes required to be reported would help, along with workers consciously going through those with their EBD customers could help.
-

BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS": **The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for February 2005 (including client errors):**

Walworth County, $301 Client Error: The customer failed to report an increase in earned income subsequent to application that took the household over the 130% Federal Poverty Level, a required reporting threshold which was explained to her in her notices.

Milwaukee County, $146 Agency Preventable Error: Client reported a job ended; while the agency requested the verification no action was ever taken subsequently, so the income continued to be budgeted, resulting in an underissuance.

Milwaukee County, $126 Client Error: The customer failed to report she received rental income.

mbw
06/20/05